



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,179	12/07/2001	William Ford	450117-03683	4143

20999 7590 08/03/2004
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

MARSCHEL, ARDIN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/008,179	FORD ET AL.
	Examiner Ardin Marschel	Art Unit 1631

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons of record as further explained as attached.
 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: 31.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-9, 31, & 32.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.
 8. The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
 10. Other: _____

The proposed claim 1 amendment adding a bound nanoparticle is a new issue that would require further consideration and/or search. Also, the re-insertion of the phrase "an derivatives thereof" in claim 8, line 3, is a new issue in this set of claims which was previously removed.

Ardin H. Marschel 8/2/04
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

Further explanation of item # 5 on the enclosed Advisory action:

The rejected claims are claims 1-9, 31, and 32 which was inadvertently incorrectly listed as 1-9, 30, and 31 on the 326 form of the Final action, mailed 2/9/04.

The NEW MATTER rejection of claim 6 is maintained due to non-entry of the amendment, filed 6/11/04. If this amendment had been entered, this rejection would have been overcome.

The objection of claim 31 due to its being not further limiting from claim 3 is maintained due to the non-entry of the amendment, filed 6/11/04. If this amendment had been entered, this rejection would have been overcome.

The rejection of claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is maintained due to the non-entry of the amendment, filed 6/11/04. If this amendment had been entered, this rejection would have been overcome.

The prior art rejections based on Rombeck et al. or Beyer et al. are maintained due to the non-entry of the amendment, filed 6/11/04, but would have been overcome if the amendment had been entered.

The prior art rejection based on Nilsen et al. is maintained due to the non-entry of the amendment, filed 6/11/04. If the amendment had been entered, this prior art rejection would have been also further maintained because multi-nanoparticle complexes with many bead layers with distinct beads also are disclosed which would have still anticipated the instant claims wherein the presence of a bound nanoparticle is required, if the amendment had been entered.

No claim is allowed.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the

Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 2, 2004

Ardin H. Marschel 8/2/04
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER